



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,571	10/28/2003	Amol S. Pandit	200210160-1	9180

22879 7590 07/27/2007
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HERNANDEZ, NELSON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/27/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/695,571

Applicant(s)

PANDIT ET AL.

Examiner

Nelson D. Hernandez

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The Examiner acknowledges the new title filed on May 8, 2007. The new title is acceptable.

Response to Amendment

2. The Examiner acknowledges the amended claims filed on May 8, 2007. **Claims 1, 11, and 15** have been amended.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to **independent claims 1, 11, and 15** have been considered, however, based on the claims as now amended, a new interpretation of the reference previously used (Takahashi) to reject **independent claims 1, 11, and 15**, has been made as discussed below.

Also, the Applicant argues the following:

- a. Takahashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "***the platform may be rotated relative to the base and about an axis of rotation***".

➤ The Examiner disagrees. The amended claim as written still reads on the Takahashi reference. As shown in fig. 13, Takahashi discloses a system (Fig. 13) which docks a camera (Camera 510 shown in fig. 11), comprising: a base (Fig. 13: 602); and a platform (Figs. 13: 604) configured to dock with the camera

and configured to couple to the base such that the **platform (604) may be rotated relative to the base (602) and about an axis of rotation** (Note that the platform rotates about the base 602 as taught in page 7, ¶ 0111-0118) See also axis of rotation as shown in figs. 13 and 14).

b. Takahashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "**rotating the camera relative to the base and about an axis of rotation**".

➤ The Examiner disagrees. The amended claim as written still reads on the Takahashi reference. As shown in fig. 13, Takahashi discloses a method for docking a camera (Camera 510 as shown in fig. 11), the method comprising the steps of: coupling the camera to a docking station platform (see docking station platform 604 of docking station 700 as shown in Fig. 13); and **rotating the camera relative to the base and about an axis of rotation** (See axis of rotation as shown in figs. 13 and 14; note that the platform rotates about the base 602 as taught in page 7, ¶ 0111-0118), the rotation permitted by the docking station platform configured to couple to a docking station base such that the docking station platform may be rotated about the axis of rotation (Page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102; page 7, ¶ 0111-0118).

c. Takahashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "**means for rotating the camera about an axis of rotation**".

➤ The Examiner disagrees. The amended claim as written still reads on the Takahashi reference. As shown in fig. 13, Takahashi discloses a system (Fig. 13) for docking a camera (Camera 510 as shown in fig. 11), comprising: means

(See platform 605 made as a recess to fit securely the camera 510 as shown in fig. 13) for physically coupling the camera to a docking station platform; means (Fig.14: 608) for communicatively coupling the camera to a docking station platform; and **means** (Fig. 13: 702) **for rotating the camera relative to a docking station base and about an axis of rotation** (note that the platform rotates about the base 602 as taught in page 7, ¶ 0111-0118), the rotation permitted by the docking station platform configured to couple to a docking station base such that the docking station platform may be rotated about the axis of rotation (See axis of rotation as shown in figs. 13 and 14) (Page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102; page 7, ¶ 0111-0118).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claim 1-4, 6 and 9-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi, US 2004/0004671.**

Regarding claim 1, Takahashi discloses a system (Fig. 13) which docks a camera (Camera 510 as shown in fig. 11), comprising: a base (Fig. 13: 602); and a

platform (Fig. 13: 604) configured to dock with the camera and configured to couple to the base such that the platform may be rotated relative to the base (Note that the platform rotates about the base 602 as taught in page 7, ¶ 0111-0118) about an axis of rotation (See axis of rotation as shown in figs. 13 and 14) (Page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102; page 7, ¶ 0111-0118).

Regarding claim 2, Takahashi discloses that the camera, when docked to the platform, may be rotated about the axis of rotation (Page 7, ¶ 0111-0118).

Regarding claim 3, Takahashi discloses a connection member (Figs. 11: 608 and 14: 608) coupled to the platform (Figs. 11: 604 and 14: 604) and configured to insert into a matching recess residing in the camera (Recess having the connector 518 as shown in fig. 11) such that when the camera is docked to the platform, the camera is rigidly coupled to the connection member (Page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102).

Regarding claim 4, Takahashi discloses a plurality of connectors (Fig. 14: 608 and fig. 11: 612) configured to communicatively couple the docked camera with a processing system (Computer 200 as shown in fig. 1) (Page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102).

Regarding claim 6, Takahashi discloses a cavity (See platform made as a recess to fit securely the camera 510 as shown in figs. 11, 13 and 14) residing in a top surface of the platform, the cavity corresponding to the base of the camera such that when the camera is docked to the platform, the camera is rigidly coupled to the platform (Page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102).

Regarding claim 9, Takahashi discloses a communication device (USB terminal 112 as shown in fig. 11), wherein the communication device uses a communication medium to communicatively couple the docked camera to a processing system (Computer 200 as shown in fig. 1) (Page 6, ¶ 0100).

Regarding claim 10, claim 10 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "comprises at least one selected from a group consisting of a wire connection medium, an infrared medium, a cable medium, a microwave medium, a radio frequency (RF) medium, an intermediary communication system may be employed, a telephony system medium and an Internet medium", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Takahashi discloses that the communication medium comprises a wire connection medium (USB cable 210 as shown in fig. 1 using USB terminal 112 as shown in fig. 11) (Page 2, ¶ 0040; page 6, ¶ 0100).

Regarding claim 11, Takahashi discloses a method for docking a camera (Camera 510 as shown in fig. 11), the method comprising the steps of: coupling the camera to a docking station platform (see docking station platform 604 of docking station 700 as shown in Fig. 13); and rotating the camera relative to the base and about an axis of rotation (See axis of rotation as shown in figs. 13 and 14; note that the

platform rotates about the base 602 as taught in page 7, ¶ 0111-0118), the rotation permitted by the docking station platform configured to couple to a docking station base such that the docking station platform may be rotated about the axis of rotation (Page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102; page 7, ¶ 0111-0118).

Regarding claim 12, Takahashi discloses the step of communicating information from the camera to a processing system (with USB cable 210 as shown in fig. 1 using USB terminal 112 as shown in fig. 11 to communicate to computer 200 shown in fig. 1) (Page 2, ¶ 0040; page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102).

Regarding claim 13, Takahashi discloses the step of communicating further comprises the step of communication with a communication medium used by a communication device (USB cable 210 as shown in fig. 1 using USB terminal 112 as shown in fig. 11) (Page 2, ¶ 0040; page 6, ¶ 0100).

Regarding claim 14, claim 14 is written in a Markush type by using the expression “comprises at least one selected from a group consisting of a wire connection medium, an infrared medium, a cable medium, a microwave medium, a radio frequency (RF) medium, an intermediary communication system may be employed, a telephony system medium and an Internet medium”, meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. “A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus.” The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Takahashi discloses that the communication medium comprises at least one selected from a group consisting of a wire connection medium (USB cable 210 as shown in fig. 1 using USB terminal 112 as shown in fig. 11) (Page 2, ¶ 0040; page 6, ¶ 0100).

Regarding claim 15, Takahashi discloses a system (Fig. 13) for docking a camera (Camera 510 as shown in fig. 11), comprising: means (See platform 605 made as a recess to fit securely the camera 510 as shown in fig. 13) for physically coupling the camera to a docking station platform; means (Fig.14: 608) for communicatively coupling the camera to a docking station platform; and means (Fig. 13: 702) for rotating the camera relative to a docking station base and about an axis of rotation (note that the platform rotates about the base 602 as taught in page 7, ¶ 0111-0118), the rotation permitted by the docking station platform configured to couple to the docking station base such that the docking station platform may be rotated about the axis of rotation (See axis of rotation as shown in figs. 13 and 14) (Page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102; page 7, ¶ 0111-0118).

Regarding claim 16, Takahashi discloses rigidly coupling the camera to the docking station platform (using connection member 608 to be connected to connection terminal 518; see Figs. 11 and 14) (Page 5, ¶ 0094 – page 6, ¶ 0102).

Regarding claim 17, Takahashi discloses means for communicating information from the camera to a processing system (with USB cable 210 as shown in fig. 1 using USB terminal 112 as shown in fig. 11 to communicate to computer 200 shown in fig. 1) (Page 2, ¶ 0040; page 6, ¶ 0100).

Regarding claim 18, Takahashi discloses that the means for communicating further comprises means for communicating with a communication medium used by a communication device (USB cable 210 as shown in fig. 1 using USB terminal 112 as shown in fig. 11) (Page 2, ¶ 0040; page 6, ¶ 0100).

Regarding claim 19, claim 19 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "comprises at least one selected from a group consisting of a wire connection medium, an infrared medium, a cable medium, a microwave medium, a radio frequency (RF) medium, an intermediary communication system may be employed, a telephony system medium and an Internet medium", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Takahashi discloses that the communication medium comprises a wire connection medium (USB cable 210 as shown in fig. 1 using USB terminal 112 as shown in fig. 11) (Page 2, ¶ 0040; page 6, ¶ 0100).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, US 2004/0004671 in view of Omps, US Patent 7,163,181 B2.**

Regarding claim 5, Takahashi does not explicitly disclose at least one leg coupled to the base.

However, Omps teaches a system (Figs. 1 and 2) which docks a camera (Fig. 1: 12), comprising: a base (Fig. 1: 18); and a platform (connector structure 28 as shown in fig. 1) configured to dock with the camera and configured to couple to the base (See fig. 1, the platform is coupling to the base using positioning member) such that the platform may be rotated relative to the base and about an axis of rotation. Omps also discloses that the base is connected to a support system such as a tripod (See fig. 1: 14) (Col. 4, line 55 – col. 5, line 48).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Takahashi in view of Omps as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Takahashi to have the system including a tripod to raise the camera to a predetermined height. The motivation to do so would have been to maintain the camera in a steady position in order to capture images without blurring caused by handshake.

6. Claims 7, 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, US 2004/0004671 in view of Rudduck, US 2003/0075603 A1.

Regarding claim 7, Takahashi does not explicitly disclose that the platform further comprises a pedestal platform, the pedestal platform configured to dock the camera and to display marketing devices placed on the pedestal platform.

However, Rudduck teaches a display console (See figs. 1, 5, 8, 9, 9A and 10) comprising a pedestal platform (Figs. 1: 12; 8: 68 and 10: 68) for docking or placing merchandise (wrist watch or any other object for sale), said pedestal platform comprises connection means to secure in place the object being docketed or place in said pedestal platform and wherein said pedestal platform comprising a space wherein a display (Figs. 8: 80 and 10: 80) is placed to display marketing device serving as an interface to perform transaction between customer and store related to the product being purchased (Page 4, ¶ 0080; page 5, ¶ 0085-0087 and 0093; page 6, ¶ 0100-0104). Rudduck discloses that although the invention is disclosed to certain objects being in the pedestal, the invention is not limited to those specific objects and can be done to any other product (Page 1, ¶ 0020).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Takahashi in view of Rudduck as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rudduck by having a pedestal platform, the pedestal platform configured to dock the camera and to display marketing devices placed on the pedestal platform. The motivation to do so would have been to enable a customer to

obtain the necessary information of a product of interest before making a decision of buying it as suggested by Rudduck (Page 6, ¶ 0099-0101).

Regarding claim 8, the combined teaching of Takahashi in view of Rudduck as applied to claim 8, teaches a pedestal base; and a plurality of pedestal platforms wherein a plurality of cameras may be docked (See Rudduck, a plurality of pedestal platforms (See, fig. 10; platform pedestal shown in fig. 9: 66); the Takahashi in view of Rudduck combination would suggest the pedestal base having a plurality of pedestal platforms wherein a plurality of cameras may be docked). Grounds for rejecting claim 8 apply here.

Regarding claim 20, limitations have been discussed in claim 8.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Marihugh, US Patent 6,698,597 B2 discloses a system to which docks a plurality of cameras (Fig. 1: 32 and fig. 2: 35), comprising: a base (Fig. 1: 12); and a platforms (Fig. 1, platforms 30b) configured to dock with the camera and configured to couple to the base (See fig. 1), wherein the platform further comprises a pedestal platform (Fig. 1: 30a), the pedestal platform configured to dock the camera and to display marketing devices (See monitor 30 as shown in fig. 1, used to display video advertising material related to the products in the platforms) placed on the pedestal

Art Unit: 2622

platform (Col. 2, lines 30-43; col. 3, lines 14-41; col. 4, lines 10-21; col. 4, lines 43-67; col. 5, lines 1-30).

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

NDHH
July 12, 2007



LIN YE
SPE. ART UNIT 2622